

FOREIGN POLICY BULLETIN

Univ. of the South
The Library
Sewanee, Tenn.

LS-1



1918-1950

An analysis of current international events

FOREIGN POLICY ASSOCIATION • INCORPORATED • 22 EAST 38TH STREET • NEW YORK 16, N. Y.

VOL. XXX No. 7

NOVEMBER 24, 1950

Senate Committee Choice Will Show G.O.P. Trend

WASHINGTON—The concept of bipartisan foreign policy will be severely tested in Congress when American policy in Asia comes up for debate. On November 16 President Truman, at a press conference, gave assurance to the Chinese Communists that "we never at any time entertained any intention to carry hostilities into China." Critics of the Administration argued during the election campaign that Communists now govern the China mainland only because the President had not vigorously encouraged and helped the Chinese Nationalists to repel Mao Tse-tung's forces.

The ultimate effect of the elections on the contest for control of United States foreign policy will become clearer when the 82nd Congress determines the make-up of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee. A related question is whether the demand of some Republicans for further intervention in Asia will have as a corollary decline of our interest in Europe.

Senate Committee Contest

The election having increased their number in the Senate from 42 to 47, the Republicans assume that they will increase their membership in the Foreign Relations Committee from five to six when the 82nd Congress convenes. Republican leaders in the Senate are already discussing whether they should choose as their new member a Senator who has supported the Administration's foreign policy, as have such present Republican members as Arthur H. Vandenberg of Michigan, H. Alexander Smith of New Jersey and Henry Cabot Lodge, Jr., of Massachusetts, or should select a strong critic

of the Administration. The chief candidates are Wayne L. Morse of Oregon, an independent Republican, friendly to, but not an unquestioning follower of, President Truman in world affairs, and William F. Knowland of California, the leading Senatorial advocate for increased United States support to Chiang Kai-shek.

The other Republican members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, Bourke B. Hickenlooper of Iowa and Alexander Wiley of Wisconsin, as well as Vandenberg, Smith and Lodge, usually support the Administration. The Democrats will have to find replacements on the Committee for the defeated Elbert D. Thomas of Utah, Millard E. Tydings of Maryland and Claude D. Pepper of Florida. The returning Democratic members are Chairman Tom Connally of Texas, Walter F. George of Georgia, Theodore Francis Green of Rhode Island, Brien McMahon of Connecticut and J. William Fulbright of Arkansas.

Morse's claim to the seat he wants rests on seniority. He entered the Senate in January 1945; Knowland, in September of that year. Hitherto Morse has supported most of Knowland's proposals for Asia, and Knowland has often supported the Administration's policies for Europe. But Knowland appears unfriendly to the Administration because he has made a partisan issue of Far Eastern policy; because, like Senators Robert A. Taft of Ohio and Joseph R. McCarthy of Wisconsin, he implies that alleged Communist sympathizers in the State Department are responsible for the rise of communism in China; and because in 1949 and 1950 he voted to reduce the sums authorized for

the Economic Cooperation Administration and the Mutual Defense Assistance Program in Europe. Twice within the past two years Knowland has tried to arrange for appearances before congressional committees by General Douglas MacArthur, with whom makers of policy in the State Department disagree concerning the best means of fulfilling the role of the United States in world affairs. The choice of Knowland for Foreign Relations Committee membership is supported by Senators who are far more critical of the Administration's relations with Europe than he is.

Morse's Record

Morse is one of six Republican Senators who in 1947, 1948, 1949 and 1950 voted for the foreign policy bills which the Democratic Senatorial Campaign Committee considered the "key" to American foreign policy. He was one of four Republicans who voted against every one of the 17 amendments to foreign policy bills which the Campaign Committee designated "crippling." Most of those bills concerned Europe.

He has not advertised his criticism of Far Eastern policy, but on August 9, 1949 he signed, along with Knowland and eight other Republican Senators, a letter to Louis A. Johnson, then Defense Secretary, urging that General MacArthur be brought home from his duties as Supreme Commander for the Allied Forces in Japan in order to testify on the pending Mutual Defense Assistance Bill which the Administration devised in support of Europe. He also requested President Truman to declare that the United States had

Contents of this BULLETIN may be reproduced with credit to the Foreign Policy Association

no intention of recognizing the Chinese Communist government. Morse has the backing of Senator Vandenberg, who

wrote him on November 10: "I should say the path is now clear for you to cash your IOU on a seat in the Foreign Re-

lations Committee"; and he carries the good wishes of the Administration.

BLAIR BOLLES

Will U.S. Implement Gray Economic Policy Report?

The Gray report on foreign economic policies—hailed as "monumental" by President Truman—brings a refreshing frankness to consideration of America's role in the world economy. Rarely has official Washington produced a report which discusses questions of policy with the scope, lucidity, and concreteness of the document that Gordon Gray, former Secretary of the Army, submitted to the White House on November 10.

The study was originally intended to assess and analyze the nature of the economic problems that would exist after termination of the Marshall plan. Since the President requested the investigation last March, however, the tremendous impact that the fighting in Korea had on the world's economies necessitated alteration and enlargement of the Gray committee's frame of reference. The great merit of the Gray report does not lie in any single proposal or suggestion that it makes but rather in the composite and well-rounded analysis it provides.

The report accepts as self-evident that the role of our foreign economic policy has been and is "to build the economic conditions and relationships needed for the growth of democratic societies able to defend themselves and to improve their living standards." Aware that the Soviet Union is making political capital out of the "swelling social and economic pressures now dominant throughout the world," the Gray committee emphasizes that the aim of effectively carrying out our objectives should have priority.

Major Economic Problems

The study indicates the major obstacles which interfere with a viable world economy. These difficulties for the most part are the ones that the Economic Cooperation Administration, the Organization for European Economic Cooperation and the United Nations and its various commissions and specialized agencies have been grappling with in recent years. One new and important development, however, is stressed. As a result of recently increased military requirements, European nations will have to cut down on civilian output and thereby sacrifice some potential exports, as well as expand imports of raw

materials whose prices have skyrocketed since the Korean war. This deterioration in their balance of payments is bound to become increasingly important as the rearmament effort proceeds.

Eschewing debate on the merits of isolationism, the study urges that the United States, apart from military equipment, should be prepared to aid the Western European economies for another three or four years. The volume of aid should be determined by the defense effort actually undertaken by the individual nations as well as by its likely impact on the economies of this and recipient nations. These considerations and decisions should be worked out through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

It is considered extremely urgent that a vigorous and effective program of economic aid to the underdeveloped areas be adopted. By recommending a flow of nearly a billion dollars a year to the underindustrialized areas, the report seems to imply an attitude of doubt concerning the possible efficacy of the present Point Four program of approximately \$30 million. To facilitate the movement of capital, the report recommends that loans be untied, tax incentives to potential investors be made more attractive and the lending power of the Export-Import Bank be increased from \$3.5 billion to a total of \$5 billion.

This country is urged to work for the reduction of trade barriers both here and abroad, support the Bretton Woods agencies and ratify the proposed charter of the International Trade Organization. The delicate subject of American agricultural policy is discussed with surprising firmness. According to the Gray report, modification of the present technique of subsidies and supports would have a distinctly beneficial effect on our international relations.

It is suggested that, so far as possible, this country utilize the machinery of the United Nations to help develop a multi-lateral and cooperative approach to foreign economic problems.

The trenchant observations of the Gray report are no guarantee, however, that concrete measures implementing its conclusions will emerge. The record to date does not offer much reason for optimism.

The possibilities of recasting our farm policy are slight—although in times of shortages and rising prices a support program is usually meaningless; the International Trade Organization appears to be a "dead duck" as far as Congress is concerned; and despite strong backing from the State Department, the Commerce Department, the Treasury, the ECA and the United States Tariff Commission, the Administration has been unable to secure passage of the relatively innocuous Customs Simplification Act. While we press the British to open sterling markets to American goods, any intimation that this nation intends to reduce tariffs brings such an outcry from advocates of protectionism that the attempt is usually abandoned. It remains to be seen if the Gray study can instill vitality into a Point Four program so limited as to appear ineffectual to potential recipients in Asia.

Shadow or Substance?

Perhaps the most disturbing conflict between actual and proposed policy revolves about the direction and purpose of American aid. The Gray report unequivocally states that economic assistance should be used to help the free and democratic nations so that the danger from possible Communist aggression, either internal or external, is minimized. Yet this country is aiding nations which cannot be described as democratic and which refuse to make economic reforms that are necessary for effective utilization of American loans and grants. The decision on November 16 to authorize dollar loans of \$62 million to Franco is sharply at variance with the tenor of the Gray report. Economic aid to the governments of Syngman Rhee, Bao Dai and Marshal Pibul of Thailand is not likely to bring about the land reform that is desperately needed in Asian nations.

It is to be hoped that discussion of the Gray report will lead to an evaluation of American foreign economic policy in overall terms and that those features of our current programs which are inconsistent with the general objective of building stable and democratic economies will undergo alterations.

HOWARD C. GARY

Internal Problems Dominate Indian Politics

LUCKNOW—The Congress party, once a united national front against Britain which found room in its ranks for Hindus and Muslims, for conservatives and Socialists, is now in the process of shifting its sights from rebellion to reconstruction. This shift, unexpectedly aggravated by the partition of 1947, is a severe test of the political wisdom and professed ideals of the party's leadership.

Vigorous Self-Criticism

Opinion in India varies widely on the question whether or not this test has been or can be successfully met. Critics of the Congress party—and none are more outspoken, indeed vilifying, than the leaders themselves—point the finger incessantly at shortcomings which cause them to view the future with pessimism. The picture they paint of India in the wake of independence is dark beyond belief. Corruption, nepotism and black-market profiteering, they say, are rampant; the people are either indifferent to the faults of the party's top men or else show a dangerous tendency to worship them like "political pandas," to quote Acharya J. B. Kripalani, unsuccessful candidate for president of the Congress against Purushottamdas Tandon.

The Indians, the critics complain, do not work hard enough and are reluctant to undergo the sacrifices necessary to make independence a reality. Government decisions on economic matters—notably controls on such necessities as sugar and cotton cloth—are haphazard, dishonestly applied and completely unrelated to an over-all plan for the development of the nation's economy. Communal strife continues to poison relations with Pakistan in spite of the Nehru-Liaquat Ali Khan agreement on minorities signed in New Delhi on April 8. The persistence of the caste system obstructs social mobility, and thereby hampers the maximum national effort necessary to provide at least a subsistence living standard for the growing population and to encourage foreign aid in the form of governmental grants or private investments. Political opposition is held in check, and the method of detention without trial is used to eliminate persons who are considered dangerous to the safety of the state—a loose phrase arbitrarily applied.

If these stringent criticisms are accepted on faith, one might well despair of the outlook for India. Yet an objective examination of the political and economic

balance-sheet after only three years of independence, during which India had to absorb 5.5 million refugees from Pakistan, reveals many reasons for hope. The very vigor of the strictures daily voiced by the Congress party leaders shows at least willingness to discuss controversial issues and a notable sensitiveness to public opinion. And public opinion is being constantly assayed by Prime Minister Jawaharlal Nehru, Deputy Prime Minister Sardar Patel, Congress President Tandon and others who travel the length and breadth of the land with an energy that staggers American observers. It is a fascinating spectacle to see Indian political leaders talking with, rather than addressing, audiences of many thousands—with Nehru, who could have been a distinguished actor had he not sought other laurels, easily outshining his colleagues. While some critics feel that the cabinet ministers would do better to cut down on travel and attend to business in New Delhi, these frequent contacts with the immense population of a far-flung land where illiteracy is still the rule bring about a rough and ready democratic process, that may prove a safeguard against irresponsible dictatorship.

Friendship for Britain

While old India hands admit that the administration has deteriorated somewhat, due in part to the difficulties of recruiting adequate government personnel, they believe the Indians are perhaps too harsh about their own faults, which seem relatively mild compared to those of other peoples, in Europe as well as Asia. Perhaps the greatest deterrent to further decline, paradoxical as this may seem to Americans, is the undisguised admiration of the Indians for British standards of administration and justice. It is because these standards are constantly recalled by the people, as well as by the Congress party, that the Indians often feel seemingly excessive disillusionment about their inability to measure up to the British yardstick.

Both the Indians and the British agree that never have relations between the two peoples been so cordial now that they are no longer overshadowed by the uneasy coexistence of the rulers and the ruled. The psychological release experienced by the Indian people following independence has given them a strong sense of dignity and a passionate desire not to fall short

of their own expectations.

Not that India has achieved freedom from all the tensions which have darkened and still continue to darken the life of a docile and friendly people endowed with high intelligence of an unusually subtle kind but also with a powerful emotionalism that can plunge it overnight into violence, as was shown by the communal riots of 1947. While strife between the Hindus and the 35 million Muslims left in India is now in abeyance, the possibility that it might flare up at any moment casts a long shadow on the nation's life.

The economic dislocations precipitated by the partition—which cut India off from the jute and cotton of Pakistan, the two principal raw materials used by its factories—threaten to increase communal tensions. If unemployment should grow or the government attempt to hold wages down while allowing prices to rise, the situation would be aggravated still further. The land reform program which the Congress party hopes to carry through before next year is strongly resisted by the *zamindars* (landlords), notably in the area of which Lucknow is the capital, and the opposition of Hindu reformers to the land-owning middle class, in Lucknow predominantly Muslim, is superimposed on religious divergences between Muslims and Hindus.

Predominance of Congress

Yet the surprising thing is that in spite of highly complex and explosive problems which might well have caused the overthrow of another government during the past three tumultuous years, the Congress remains unchallenged to any serious extent. It has succeeded in establishing a strong centralized one-party government which so far, relatively speaking, has proved able to govern with considerable moderation—except for the growing number of political *détenus* held in jail without trial. These imprisonments are regarded by thoughtful Indians as a grave threat to the prospects for democracy. True, the Congress has sloughed off the Socialist party, which after withdrawing in 1948 is making headway, but only slowly—partly because the Congress itself proclaims its faith in socialism and the welfare state; and it may slough off other groups from its once all-embracing membership.

But neither the Socialists, who draw inspiration from British Labor while emphasizing India's peculiar conditions, nor the Communists, discredited by their war-time refusal to aid the national struggle against Britain, are expected to register significant gains in the general elections scheduled for April 1951, when 170 million voters will go to the polls. If an effective opposition is to emerge, it may have to come out of the ranks of the Congress party itself, as happened this year in Turkey when a viable opposition emerged from the national front once forged by Kemal Ataturk. In a sense the differentiation has already started, with Nehru symbolizing a moderate Left concerned with world affairs and Patel a moderate Right focused on domestic problems.

There is no widespread support in India, however, for a policy oriented to the Right, in spite of frequent assertions that the industrialist Birla, Gandhi's benefactor, exercises a powerful influence over Patel. A popular saying here is that every Indian is a socialist; but while the Socialist party talks and acts Left, the Congress talks Left and acts Right. But neither is there a marked trend toward communism in the sense of widespread support of an organized Communist party—although continued deterioration of living standards might bring about a movement of despair that could be channeled either into communism or into the fanatical Hinduism preached by the semifascist Rashtriya Swayam Sevak Sangh (RSS). Harsh economic facts—most important of all the rising pressure of population on the resources of an as yet underdeveloped economy—may prove more important than political factors in determining India's future course. Patel, speaking at Indore on October 2 in the language of a man of peasant origin, summed up the situation when he said:

But you know that when a farmer wishes to produce grain from his fields, he has to clear the field, manure it, plough it and water it, and then put some seeds into it. So far as the states are concerned, the clearing process has been finished, and we have now consolidated the whole of India into one union. Except for a small bit which has gone over to Pakistan, we have made India one and indivisible. All this has been accomplished, but we have yet to manure and water it and then plant trees in it. All this requires a great deal of hard work.

When Americans wonder why India strives to keep aloof from the Korean war and other involvements that might spell war, they must bear in mind the magnitude of the tasks faced by this newly liberated country. Perhaps if we recall the desire of the United States to avoid "entangling alliances" during the early period of its independence we shall be better prepared to understand the attitude of Nehru and his associates.

VERA MICHELES DEAN

(The fourth of a series of articles on current developments in Asia.)

Branch and Affiliate Meetings

EASTON, November 27, *Background of the Korean Situation*, Younghill Kang
CLEVELAND, November 28, *The Power Created by the Marshall Plan*, Barry Bingham
DETROIT, November 28, *Canadian Policies in World Affairs*, John Marshall
PITTSBURGH, November 28, *A Report on Europe and Asia*, Paul Anderson, William Block
COLUMBUS, November 29, *Labor and Foreign Policy*, Michael Ross
DETROIT, November 29, *Point Four*, Alfred H. Kelly
ALBANY, November 30, *Europe in 1951—Armed, Fed or Forgotten*, Howard C. Gary
CINCINNATI, December 2, *Model UN Assembly*, Lord MacDonald of Gwaensyger
NEW YORK, December 2, Luncheon, The Right Honorable Hector McNeil
LYNN, December 4, *Inside Russia*, Vladimir Petrov
BETHLEHEM, December 5, *Roads to Peace*, M. J. Coldwell
ELMIRA, December 5, *The USSR Today*, Harry Schwartz
CLEVELAND, December 6, *The United Nations*
NEW YORK, December 6, *Reports From Asia and Europe*, Vera M. Dean, Brooks Emeny
DETROIT, December 7, *Asia Today*, Carl Remer, Russell Fifield
POUGHKEEPSIE, December 8, *Has Korea Changed Our Foreign Policy?* Harold Hoskins, Richard H. Rovere, Charles Griffin, H. N. MacCracken

Days for Decision, by Anthony Eden. Boston, Houghton Mifflin Company, 1950. \$3.

The former British Foreign Secretary and heir-apparent to Mr. Churchill as leader of the Conservatives presents his views on socialism, Britain's economic plight and Commonwealth and foreign affairs in a series of twenty-seven speeches and articles.

Geo-Economic Regionalism and World Federation, by Maurice Parmelee. New York, Exposition Press, 1949. \$2.50.

A proposal for the establishment of about fourteen regions of the world based on geographic and economic criteria, which, while not eliminating the traditional national political structures, would, in the author's view, reduce their significance and lay the basis for effective world government.

News in the Making

HOW MUCH FOR ARMS IN BRITAIN?: Pressure is mounting within the British Labor party to reduce the government's defense commitments from the \$9.5 billion planned for the next three years. Criticism of arms expenditures comes from several sources in Labor ranks: those who want to reduce Britain's dependence on American aid; those who think economic recovery may be jeopardized; and those who are influenced by the party's former pacifist ideals. While this group is unlikely to outweigh other counsel within the cabinet, it may retard the government's program.

PROPOSALS FOR A EUROPEAN ARMY: The permanent commission of the European Assembly, meeting in Strasbourg on November 18, is focusing its efforts on attempts to implement the Assembly's resolution of last August urging the establishment of a strong unified European army. One of the commission's first decisions was to call on French Foreign Minister Robert Schuman to explain the French proposal for a European army, which parallels the Assembly's plan.

GERMAN OPPOSITION TO ARMING: The problems raised by Anglo-American differences with France over the use of German soldiers in a European army were further accentuated on November 20, when a large plurality of German voters, in elections to the state parliaments of Hesse and Wuerttemberg-Baden, supported the Social Democratic party. This party, challenging the views of Christian Democratic Chancellor Konrad Adenauer, had made its opposition to remilitarization without allied guarantees the main campaign issue.

EL SALVADOR'S COMPLAINT: El Salvador—despite marked reserve on the part of the Western powers—is pressing consideration of the Tibetan issue on the UN General Assembly. Not only does El Salvador's complaint involve the decision as to when an action constitutes aggression. It also highlights the anomalous position of small countries in the UN which often contend that they are treated as pawns of the great powers without any independent role of their own.

FOREIGN POLICY BULLETIN. Vol. XXX, No. 7, NOVEMBER 24, 1950. Published weekly from September through May inclusive and biweekly during June, July and August by the Foreign Policy Association, Incorporated, National Headquarters, 22 East 38th Street, New York 16, N. Y. BROOKS EMENY, President; VERA MICHELES DEAN, Editor; WILLIAM W. WADE, Associate Editor. Re-entered as second-class matter June 4, 1948, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Four Dollars a Year. Please allow at least one month for change of address on membership publications.